

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed, and reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9 and 10 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gonzales (6,736,034).

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 3, 5 and 8 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gonzales (6,736,034) in view of Jarvis (6,092,441).

Responsive to this, claim 2 is deleted and claim 1 is amended which is substantially the combination of original claims 1 and 2 so as to make the claimed invention more distinguishably patentable over the prior art references cited by the Examiner. In addition, claims 3-5 are deleted. Applicant also submits the following comments.

The claimed invention discloses “a connector, comprising an operation member, and a connector seat, wherein:

the operation member includes an operation seat;

the connector seat is combined with the operation member and includes:

a main body movably mounted on the operation seat of the operation member;

a movable rod slidably mounted in the main body and has a first end rested on an end face of the operation seat of the operation member and a second end having a periphery formed with a receiving cavity;

a positioning ball movably mounted on the main body and aligned with the receiving cavity of the movable rod; and

at least one spring mounted on the movable rod and urged between the main body and the movable rod;

the main body of the connector seat has an inner wall formed with an annular elongated slide groove, and the operation seat is provided with a retaining ball slidably mounted in the slide groove of the main body” as disclosed in the amended claim 1.

With reference to the Gonzales reference, it disclosed a locking socket wrench device 10 comprising a wrench 11 having a head 13 and a connector 15 rotatably mounted on the head 13 and received in the opening 14 of the wrench 11, an extension 26 having a first end 27 mounted on the connector 15 of the wrench 11 and a second end 28 containing a first ball 44, a shaft 40 movably mounted in the extension 26 and having a first flange 41 received in the first end 27 of the extension 26 and a second flange 42 received in the first end 28 of the extension 26 and rested on the first ball 44, a spring 43 mounted on the shaft 40 and biased between the first flange 41 of the shaft 40 and the extension 26, a connector release member 45 movably mounted in the opening 14 of the wrench 11, and an extension release member 48 movably mounted in the connector release member 45 and rested on the

first flange 41 of the shaft 40 to push the shaft 40 to move downward to detach the first ball 44 so as to release the socket 36.

In comparison, in the Gonzales reference, the inner wall of the extension 26 is not formed with an annular elongated slide groove, and the extension release member 48 is not provided with a retaining ball slidably mounted in the slide groove of the extension 26.

Thus, the Gonzales reference does not teach “the main body of the connector seat has an inner wall formed with an annular elongated slide groove, and the operation seat is provided with a retaining ball slidably mounted in the slide groove of the main body” as disclosed in the amended claim 1 of the claimed invention.

In addition, the Gonzales reference does not teach “an extension mounted between the operation seat and the main body and movable relative to the main body and the operation seat and rested on the movable rod, so that the movable rod mounted in the main body is pushed by the extension to move the receiving cavity to align with the positioning ball” as disclosed in the amended claim 6 of the claimed invention.

Further, the Gonzales reference does not teach “the at least one spring is a cone-shaped spring mounted on the movable rod and having a first end rested on the end face of the operation seat of the operation member and a second end rested on a stepped inside of the main body” as disclosed in the amended claim 8 of the claimed invention.

Therefore, it is apparent that the claimed invention has disclosed a connector whose structure and function are quite different from and patentably distinguishable over that of the Gonzales reference. It is believed that the Gonzales reference, whether taken alone or in combination with the Jarvis reference, does not provide the elements and objectives as are disclosed in the claimed invention, and cannot render obvious the claimed invention.

Accordingly, it is believed that the rejections of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 103(a) should be withdrawn, and the amended claim 1 should be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims 6-10 should be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, he is urged to contact Applicant's attorney at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Charles E. Baxley

Charles E. Baxley
Attorney of Record
USPTO Reg. 20,149
90 John Street, 3rd Floor
New York, N.Y. 10038
Telephone 212-791-7200
Facsimile 212-791-7276
E-mail ceb@hartbaxley.com